

**From:** Aaron Smith [mailto:aaron.lorenzo@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:39 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** mpa plans

Hello, my name is Aaron Smith and I'm a free diver and fisherman, and use primarily the Sonoma and Mendocino coasts. I use the ocean not only for recreation, but also to feed my family and as a place of escape from the insane pace of modern life. I have fished and dove since boyhood, and these are traditions I want to pass on to my kids.

I support MPA plan 2XA, as it is the best compromise between use and protection of our coastal marine environment.

I worry that the 1-3 plan will result in lower daily and or annual takes of abalone, which is already severely limited. I understand that poaching is a real problem and should be dealt with by DFG, but the 3/day, 24/season abalone take is very small already and a lot of us north coast divers use abalone not just as a treat, but as a regular part of our diet.

Plan 4 is a nightmare for all of us who use the ocean resources in this area. We need to be able to safely enter and use the water, both from the shore and in kayaks, and this proposal will almost eliminate shore diving for abs and fish, and force kayak divers and anglers to make long and many times dangerous journeys in order to legally enjoy their sport or bring food home to their families.

Thank you for reading my letter and for your time in this important work. The MPLA process is a good one, and I have high hopes that a good compromise can be reached between the two needs of use and protection. When this is all over, I hope we will have a better dialog between conservationists, scientists, resource managers and all of us who use our beautiful ocean resource.

Aaron Smith

---

**From:** bradtjones@aol.com [mailto:bradtjones@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 3:10 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** Please Read

Dear Melissa,

It wasn't long ago my father and I were enjoying ourselves on a nice weekend day together. We would share stories, talk about the future, and engage in conversation anyone would love to have with their father. Do you remember those great conversations you had with your father or loved one and where you were at? It's moments like these that make up who we are and what we represent. It's moments like these I hope to pass on to my children in the near future.

For as long as you and I are here as a guest on this planet, it is important we all provide some positive impact to society and the environment. Think about what activities you do outside of work that are important to you and help you achieve who you are as a person. Can you imagine if someone were to put such heavy restrictions on that activity that it didn't make sense to do it anymore? Even though you are a good steward of that activity? Can you imagine if you had the opportunity to provide a sustainable healthy impact to the environment and still be able to participate in that activity?

This activity for me is Salt Water Fishing. #1 Priority? Safety. #2 Priority? Maintaining a sustainable

fishery for the next generation. This list could go on and on but I know you know where I am headed at this point. Please consider my support for proposal 2-XA. With this proposal in place I have conceded to the needs of environmental impact of my activity, yet allows me to continue my activity I so much love to do. It is apparent that proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay. Living in Alameda, the Bay is my port for marine use. I hope someone reads this and considers my vote for Proposal 2-XA. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Brad Jones

---

**From:** Mike Giraudo [mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:56 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2-XA

I am very much in favor of 2-XA. This is the only proposal that keeps access to safer and closer fishing areas to our harbors. As a USCG licensed captain I am very aware of the dangers to small craft when they travel far from safe harbor. The weather can change very rapidly and I am fearful that we may lose lives if the other proposals go forward.

Please give your consideration to 2-XA

Capt. Mike Giraudo  
Pacifica, CA

---

To whom it may concern

I have attended many MLPA meetings and listened carefully. At the last Stakeholders meeting in San Rafael, March 18-19<sup>th</sup> there were a few comments made by both stakeholders and the public that I thought were worth repeating.

**1. Stakeholder & Public Comment “Subregion 1 does not need a HIGH LEVEL of protection.”**  
Why does this region have 40% of its ocean in MLPA in some proposals? Central Coast MLPA's are all less than 20%

**2. Stakeholder “The Saunders Reef Proposal is unnecessary”** I'm 54 years old and in my lifetime I have never seen the Saunders Reef kelp bed as large as it is today. It's still growing in leaps and bounds, especially in the last 2 years without any protection what so ever...maybe the presents of Sea Urchin Harvest?

**3. Stakeholder “Sea Ranch has some of the largest abalone found on the coast. They are like the Old Growth Redwoods...So why are we not trying to protect them?”**

**4. Stakeholder “Salt Point State Park has better habitat than The Sea Ranch. So that's why we chose to close Salt Point.”** If the habitat is so much better, than why aren't the 10" abalone found there in abundance? Sounds to me like the menu's better at The Sea Ranch

**5. Public Comment** “My son and I go camping and fishing at Salt Point State Park because we can’t afford to rent a house at The Sea Ranch.” FYI, a 3 bedroom house for the weekend could cost anywhere from \$630.00 to over \$1000.00 The “average Joe” can’t afford these prices. Sea Ranch’s most popular rental times are Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Years. Rentals are basically limited to 6 people per house. And limit the number of cars.

**6. Public Comment** “Please save the Oyster Farming in Tamales Bay.” Losing a one of a kind, historical, local farming operation is not only bad for the local economy, but it’s not healthy for our global environment either. Where will we get oysters from next? Dirty trucking and air freight from???? They are also recycling their oyster shells to restore crumbling banks in the San Francisco Bay. We need to be very careful not to kill our small fishing villages that are spread out up and down the California coastline. They have no harmful impact on fish populations and the more they distribute locally the “Greener” we’ll all be.

**Public Access has been the biggest concern in this MLPA process.** So my question is, why take away the North end of Salt Point State Park from Gerstle Cove North to Horseshoe Cove? There are 10 times the parking areas and access for the public than the southern half of The Sea Ranch. (Compare Proposal 2XA to Proposal 13 in Subregion 1.)

**I support Proposal 2XA...100% This proposal was put together by real people who live in and know the real environment. They’ve worked extremely hard on this proposal, doing more than just looking a piece of paper with a map on it. They’ve listened, consulted to countless people who have lived on the coast for decades and who know the history. Their spacing of these MLPA’s is mindful and does the least amount of damage to our ocean and our local economy. This proposal meets all the requirements and guidelines of the MLPA process. This proposal was thought out thoroughly by its designers and should be endorsed hands down!!!**

**Cate Ratcliff Carre’  
3<sup>rd</sup> Generation, Gualala  
And Sea Ranch Property Owner**

---

**From:** CHARLES MARSHALL [mailto:wobblerite@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:40 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** In Favor of Proposal 2-XA

I’m in favor of this proposal because it appears to me to be the proposal with the best balance of conservation while allowing the recreational use of our ocean. I have a small boat and only feel safe going out of Bodega Bay due to a lack of large watercraft in the traditional fishing areas near Bodega Bay. Proposal 4 would have a negative impact for me at Bodega Bay area and so I would probably not go there anymore causing economic loss to that community. Proposal 2--XA also meets the conservation goals while be supported by a broad coalition of interests.

Charles Marshall  
Sacramento, CA

---

**From:** Debbie LeBlanc [mailto:fishdeb@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 10:26 AM  
**To:** MLPACComments  
**Subject:** Support for proposal 2-XA

March 27, 2008

Re: Supporting Proposal 2-XA

To Whom It May Concern:

This proposal, in my opinion, is the BEST proposal for all concerned, the ocean, the fishery, the fishermen and women who fish the California coast.

I was bitten by ocean fishing 25 years ago and I have never looked back. The pleasure of hooking the beautiful king salmon, or fun of lifting that huge lingcod into the boat is indescribable to me. I have never taken more than the limit, or more then I can eat. It is a staple I cannot imagine going without.

I have spent thousands and thousands of dollars in communities like Bodega Bay, either on trips, vacation rentals, tackles, etc. The lost of this revenue to communities like this will be devastating.

I believe this proposal will be fair for all. Please consider all proposals carefully, once this has been done I believe you will see that Proposal 2-XA is fair for all.

Regards,  
Fishdeb..

---

**From:** Debbie Cope [mailto:debbiecope@mindspring.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:10 PM  
**To:** MLPACComments  
**Subject:**

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California. I think this is the best for the present time. Until we can come up with something better.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socioeconomic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry! Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us (sport fishermen and women) to enjoy the sport we so love... responsibly as stewards for the Sea.

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

Deborah J. Cope

---

**From:** Dennis Lepenske [mailto:dwllepenske@ucdavis.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:05 AM

**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MPLA

As a certified SCUBA diver, a long time resident of Dixon Ca, and dedicated environmental conservationist, I'd like to express my support for proposal 2-XA in the MPLA process. This proposal has clearly demonstrated that it meets all of the goals outlined in the MPLA.

Dennis W LePenske

---

**From:** JULIE ROGERS [<mailto:julesrog@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 2:35 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2XA Proposal

I support the adoption of the 2XA proposal for MPA on the northern California coast.

Thx

Don & Julie Rogers

---

**From:** Luwana Adair [<mailto:hawksleymasonry@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 11:04 AM  
**To:** Luwana Adair  
**Subject:** Proposal 2XA.

To Whom It May Concern:

As a homeowner in the Anchor Bay Community, we support the Proposal 2XA.

As a coastal community this area thrives on fishing and recreational activities. Limiting the public use will have a negative impact on our community. Consider the economic impact to restaurants, hotels, fishing related business, commercial fishermen and their families. Not to mention the impact to the American families that enjoys spending a day fishing and exploring the sea and its creatures. How about the dangers for a recreational fishermen and his family with a smaller boat that will be forced to fish further from the shoreline?

The sea was created for our use to feed our families and enjoy is beauty. Proposal 2XA protects our rights.

Sincerely,  
Don and Darlene Hawksley

---

**From:** Don Marshall [<mailto:Don@HCPLUMBING.COM>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 4:26 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Fishing Changes on the California coast.

I am both a certified scuba diver and fisherman. I have always practiced and believe in conservation. I think measure 2-XA has the balance and conservation. Please adopt 2-XA.

Yours truly,  
Don Marshall

---

**From:** DON & JAN LARMOUR [mailto:dlarmour@att.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:36 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

I would respectfully request your consideration and support for 2-XA. This proposal achieves the scientific and conservations goals of the MLPA. It meets the DFG feasibility guidelines. It is enforceable and will have broad public support including a wide range of fishing groups. 2-XA emphasizes the total ecosystem with 7 core areas of marine reserves. Thank You Donald W. Larmour

---

**From:** EHolthouse@aol.com [mailto:EHolthouse@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:58 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** MPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

As a fourth generation Californian and avid Outdoorsman, I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socioeconomic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry! Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us (sport fishermen and women) to enjoy the sport we so love... responsibly as stewards for the Sea.

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

Eric Holthouse- Sonoma Ca

---

**From:** Gary Gale [mailto:GDGale1948@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:05 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Salmon Proposal 2-XA

Howdy,

I urge yuou to endorse and execute the plans to regain our salmon fishery which are contained in the proposal 2-XA

It's good for us who engage in salmon fishing, good for the economy, good for Fish and Game, and good for the salmon.

There is a lot at stake here as you know, so please make the right move and endorse Proposal 2-XA.

Thanks,

Gary Gale  
Suisun City, CA 94585

---

**From:** Archer Richardson [mailto:archerj@mcn.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:31 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA SUPPORTING PROPOSAL 2XA

To who it may concern

The MLPA has been like a bulldozer coming through the woods without seeing where it's going or what its running over. I'm not in favor of any proposals that have been brought to the table.

But, like the Presidential election, you need to vote or endorse one. The one that will do the least amount of damage. SO I'LL HAVE TO ENDORSE 2XA

Gordon Carre'  
Gualala, CA

---

From: Goddard, Greg [<mailto:Greg.Goddard@ucsf.edu>]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:59 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: mpla

I support 2xa  
Greg

---

**From:** Richard Navarro [<mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 10:34 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:**

My name is Hayley Navarro. I am eight years old. I love to go fishing with my dad and my 4 year old brother on the bay and the Ocean. We catch Salmon, Rockfish and sharks. I Love to show my friends and teacher pictures of our fishing trips. My dad said that we need to vote in Proposal 2-XA to have fishing on the ocean still available to us. Please help us for our fishing future.

Thank you very much,  
Haley Navarro

---

**From:** Jack A. Rauch [<mailto:jarlaw@earthlink.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 10:09 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support for Prop 2-XA

I have sport fished for over 50 years, as a matter of fact I still fish with 2 childhood friends that I have fished with all that time.

Sportfishing is a wonderful family activity with no downside. It is a positive expression of family values and a tremendous boon to our economy. Our freedom to pursue it should not lightly be curtailed.

We have gone through a decade where persons, possibly well meaning, with political and economic muscle have pushed agendas based on supposed facts that have turned out to be flat wrong. Remember acid rain, or the strongly held belief that the antarctic ice shelf was melting from a hole in the ozone caused by CFCs in aerosol cans. That led to the Montreal protocol and the dumping of massive amounts of green house gases into the atmosphere by the same groups pushing marine closures. Perhaps you remember the millenium bug when on 1/1/00 all the computers were going to crash. Then, of course, there was Iraqs weapons of mass destruction.

The Closure process has moved much too fast, it should have been halted to see if the results justified the damage being done to so many citizens.

A halt not being on the table at this point, then Prop 2-XA should be adopted as the best balance between the dictates of an ill advised scheme and the values of a free citizenry pursuing a family activity that has no downside, and is an economic engine.

---

**From:** Victoria Mansour [mailto:mansour.victoria@gene.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:02 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** In Support of MLPA Proposal 2

I a recreational fisherman with his own boat, I support the MLPA proposal 2.

I only fish hook and line maybe once a month, but I love it. Love the fresh fish when I get lucky to catch it, and love the adventure.

Trust me, it would be a lot cheaper for me to get the fish at Safeway. I just love the sport & spend lots of money on boating, tackle, etc. just to have the chance to enjoy my sport.

Thanks,

Jad

---

**From:** Ustrapper@wmconnect.com [mailto:Ustrapper@wmconnect.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 4:30 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First, I want to thank you for your service to this great State, and in particular to me, one who enjoys fishing, as you work out the details of implementing the Marine Life Protection Act. I agree with the goals that Californians had in mind when they passed this law in 1999. The most important to me are protecting the ecosystem and supporting weak fish stocks. I support MPA's where reasonable, and supported by science. I am a firm believer in conservation, maintaining healthy fish population levels, and not overfishing. I also believe that eating seafood, especially wild, sustainable seafood, is very beneficial for society as a whole, and that this should be a viable choice for all Californians. For this reason, I would like you to support Proposal 2-XA. I believe it to be the most reasonable, achieving the goals of the MLPA, meets DF&G guidelines, puts restrictions where they will help the most - and is supported by sound scientific models, has been peer reviewed by those who most understand the marine ecosystem, and yet still allows for reasonable fishing opportunities - a goal that is not mutually exclusive with the goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA also has the greatest benefits for society as a whole, including those who enjoy seeing nature thrive, and the boating, fishing,



seafood, restaurant and tourism industries in California. Furthermore, Proposal 2-XA has the support of a broad spectrum of Californians, including those who fish and those who do not. In fact, those who fish or who otherwise utilize seafood would really like to see supportable and sustainable fisheries become letter and law, obviously not wanting to kill the "goose that laid the golden egg".

I would be willing to hear your reasoning for the proposal that you finally select, and help spread the word to those in my circle of influence, and lobby the F&G commission for it's acceptance, if it can be shown to be better than Proposal 2-XA for the environment and for society.

Thank you!

Jeff J Whedbee

---

From: James H. Farmer [<mailto:jhfarmer@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 6:51 PM  
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
Subject: Option 2-XA

I am a avid scuba and free diver. I dive mostly for abalone, but on occasion i spear fish. I would like you to implement MLPA Option 2-XA. I believe this to be the most broad based option that has been formulated.

I am a enviornmentalst who constantly is looking for the best answer for Marine protection. I believe that MLPA Option 2-XA is that option.

Jim Farmer

---

**From:** Judy Rowland [<mailto:judy.rowland@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 1:59 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAscraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMarata@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** MLPA Comments-Support of Proposal 2-XA

Dear MLPA Initiative Staff,

This is an update to my previous letter submitted Sept. 28, 2007. I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA, which has replaced proposal 2 and provides a good balance between conservation, and public use and access.

Sport fishing and diving are integral to many families and communities on the California Coast. Scuba diving and free diving have brought my friends and family together several times a year over the last 20 years. I have spent many wonderful weekends at Sea Ranch under the auspices of 'abalone diving'. We don't go to get our limit of abalone to take home, but to get a few for a couple of great dinners while we are there, where we celebrate both being together and also our good fortune of living on this amazing coast.

I care deeply about the health of the ocean and coast and foster those values in my children. I urge you to support a proposal that will allow us to continue to enjoy the learning opportunities and gifts that the coastal waters provide.

Sincerely,  
Judy Rowland

---

**From:** Kevin Masuda [mailto:kmasuda@ADP.CA.GOV]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 2:06 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** I support Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA as a recreational fisherman and environmentally conscious Californian. I have been in (diver) and around the California Coast my entire life and now share the experience with my family. Please consider Proposal 2-XA as the only balanced proposal that best meets the MLPA goals.

**Kevin Masuda**

---

**From:** mark barbour [mailto:barbourmark@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:51 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:**

As a certified SCUBA diver, a long time resident of San Francisco, and dedicated environmental conservationist, I'd like to express my support for proposal 2-XA in the MPLA process. This proposal has clearly demonstrated that it meets all of the goals outlined in the MPLA.

Please let me fish with my boys!  
Thanks, Mark

---

**From:** Mark Keller [mailto:steelhead396@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 10:02 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** OUR Family Supports Proposal 2-XA

Our Family supports Proposal 2-XA

Fishing in California is all our family has ever known. Salmon in the kitchen sink was a normal routine at our house when I was young. Now as a father and husband I can share this with my children. Salmon has always been a staple food in our home. We know that this needs to be done and now. Thank you

---

**From:** Archer Richardson [mailto:archerj@mcn.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:35 PM  
**To:** Fish & Game Commission; MLPAComments  
**Subject:**

## **MLPA COMMENTS**

**I have owned a lot at The Sea Ranch for nearly 16 years. I fell in love with its beautiful meadows, forest, river, ocean front, beaches & especially the wildlife. Being able to live with while preserving nature is what The Sea Ranch stands for.**

**Most Sea Ranchers do not care to fish or abalone. But would rather observe & study all the wildlife that it has to offer.**

**My wish is that the lower half (White Barn South) of The Sea Ranch be preserved by the placement of an SMR. For those of us who just want to wonder in the tide pools and**

**enjoy what they have to offer...un-touched and un-spoiled. The northern half could be left open for those who love to fish. The Sea Ranch would be left with the best of both**

**I'm writing in SUPPORT OF 2XA because this proposal is the only proposal that allows this feature.**

**Mary Cate  
The Sea Ranch**

---

**From:** Matt Bingham [mailto:chopper130@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 4:50 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal Support

Dear BRTF Staff,

I am a 37 year old California Native who was raised by a father/grandfather who loved the outdoors. I spent my vacations as a kid camping and fishing around the state in our numerous rivers, lakes, and in the Pacific Ocean. I can honestly say that I never once got on a commercial plane to go on a vacation with my family. Nope, our family packed up the station wagon, tent trailer in tow, and we'd head out for a few days or weeks (summer) at a time to enjoy the wonderful parks this state has to offer. We fished anywhere from the Klamath River (my first fish ever was a Klamath River Steelhead, it was only a 1/2pounder, but I still remember the smile on my father and grandfathers face when I got it into the net) to the Sacramento River, out of SF Bay, Half Moon Bay, Noyo, and even Ft. Bragg. Some of my sweetest memories are of the three of us pounding water somewhere with our fishing rods. Those were the good days, long before water issues, overfished rivers, oceans, etc.....I sit here today wondering how we have come to the point we are at now? Protecting the Ocean is a fantastic idea, and something that should have been our overall "mentality" a long time ago. However, in reading comments and concerns from other people around the state, I get very ill to my stomach when its perceived that recreational fisherman are the cause for so much trouble. Recreational fisherman do not make the laws, there are state and federal agencies that do that. Those same agencies are the ones that allowed, and continue to allow commercial take of rockfish, salmon, halibut, etc....Those same agencies have allowed Long Lining, dragging and netting of fish to a point that we are now regulating everything. Was that my fault? Obviously we know the answer to that, so when I see that recreational fisherman now stand to lose so much, I have to scratch my head. We didn't allow it to get this bad.....the agencies did. Should we have allowed the commercial industry to "take" so much from the water off of California, especially knowing that such a huge percentage of it goes everywhere other than California, or the fact that a very few number of people have gotten rich from raping our natural resources? I am extremely happy to know that we are now trying to preserve our ocean for the future, but to lay blame and penalize recreational fisherman now is just wrong. Many mistakes have been made, nobody is completely innocent, but my hope is that the tax paying citizens in California who enjoy fishing in the ocean won't be penalized because of the misperceptions that many people in the general public have due to not being informed of "reality".

After reviewing the various proposals for the MLPA process, I strongly support Proposal 2-XA because it meets and exceeds the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA while complying with the feasibility guidelines of the Department of Fish and Game. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to receive the broad support of sport divers, commercial and recreational fishermen. It also provides total ecosystem protection while still providing safe and reasonable access for recreational use. The other proposals will not accomplish these same goals and will essentially turn the California coastline into an Aquarium which will restrict its use from the citizens of California.

I hope that you take the time to read my letter. I am also hoping to be a father this year, and I look forward to the days when I can take my child out and enjoy the same things I once enjoyed with my father and now deceased grandfather.

Respectfully,  
Matt Bingham  
Livermore, CA

---

From: Matt Cohen [<mailto:mcohen@business-team.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 9:51 AM  
To: MLPAComments; governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman  
Subject: Certified SCUBA divers support 2-XA. Coastal access and recreational diving in our 'backyard' is a citizens right.

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force, Mr Chrisman and Mr Schwarzenegger,

Please select Proposal 2-XA for Northern California MLPA act. Coastal access and recreational diving in our 'backyard' is a citizens right.

Eliminating recreational diving will not alter man's impact on the Pacific Ocean. Habitat destruction has been caused by a century of commercial fishing, ill advised damming of rivers, erosion from irresponsible logging, faulty sewage treatment plants and other toxic runoff from farms, factories and ranches - not the recreational fisherman.

Please consider our citizens fundamental and constitutional rights to access and utilize our natural resources. Punish big business, not individuals.

Sincereley,

Matt Cohen

---

**From:** mjr1940ryan-boat@yahoo.com [<mailto:mjr1940ryan-boat@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:31 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Comments

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for the effort you are spending on the Marine Life Protection Act project. Working out the details of implementing this 1999 California Law is no easy task. I have read the many proposals put forth to you over these last months. To me Proposal 2-XA is what the voters of California had in mind. I'll list some of the highlights that make this proposal stand out above the others. I also list some of the major differences between 2-XA and other proposals.

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. It meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. It is enforceable and is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups. I believe it will have broad public support also.

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. It places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection. It also places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by

consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay. It creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

I am a believer in conservation, maintaining healthy fish population levels are of the upmost importance to me. In closing I would ask that you take a hard look at Proposal 2-XA.

Thank you,

Michael j Ryan

San Jose, Ca

---

**From:** Mike Salvato [mailto:duceee@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 4:58 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Cc:** tadhouston@yahoo.com

**Subject:** 2-xa

I support 2-xa. It is the best Balance. Mike Salvato.

---

**From:** MSchaffer@ci.san-leandro.ca.us [mailto:MSchaffer@ci.san-leandro.ca.us]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 3:33 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Option 2XA

---

**Blue Ribbon Task Force,**

**I fully realize the difficulty in striking a balance in most any project. Considering a variety of user groups, mentalities & unproven science makes this task even more daunting. Sportsmen have long been the champions of preservation of resources while actually partaking in those resources recreationally, spiritually and consumptively. This should not be about protection for the sake of protection, but protection of the common heritage of California which we share, sometimes differently than others.**

**Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while**

incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

**We have a long way to go to counter some of man's negative influences on his environment. Let's not eliminate sportsmen from being effective messengers and "realtime" stewards and observers of the habitat and its inhabitants. In my opinion, over-restricting access is the worst thing that could happen in the long fight ahead. Losing the next generation's involved interest is at risk.**

Sincerely,  
**Mike Schaffer, lifelong sportsman and conservationist.**

---

**From:** Paul Venker [mailto:Paul@greengoinc.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:31 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** I want to keep fishing

Hello all,

I am a member of the Coastside fishing club and very proud to be.  
All I want to say is I support 2-XA so I can keep my rights as a native Californian to keep fishing and diving along the California coast.

Thanks,

Paul J. Venker  
Concord, Ca.

---

**From:** Pierre Granier [mailto:im.involved@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 2:03 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** MLPA - I support proposal 2-XA

I wish to express my support for proposal 2-XA on behalf of myself and my 2 young sons.

It is clear that this proposal meets and exceeds all of the scientific and conservationist goals mandated by the process while preserving Californians rights as laid out in the constitution. This proposal clearly represents the spirit of the law that was passed many years ago.

Pierre Granier  
Avid Conservationist, Concerned Citizen  
San Francisco, CA

---

**From:** Randy Stockman [mailto:rstockman@purfresh.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:10 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA panel adopt option 2AX

To whom it may concern.

I support Proposal 2-AX because it allows for areas to be reached by those that have small boats. I fish in the bay and ocean when weather permits and would like to continue fishing there, I urge that the MLPA panel adopt option 2AX.

Sincerely,  
Randy Stockman

---

**From:** Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 26, 2008 9:34 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** 2-XA

Hello, my name is Renee Navarro. I support 2-XA because my husband Rich Navarro is a Recreational fisherman. We enjoy many BBQs throughout the year with friends and family. It would not be the same if my Kids and husband were taken off the water because of all the closures of bodies of water. I am all for keeping the fishing stocks up, but don't feel like the other proposals are giving fisherman a fair shake... Please help us keep up family traditions and support 2-XA.

Thank you, Renee Navarro

---

**From:** Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:03 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** 2-XA

My 4 year old Daniel wanted to send a picture. He said he would like to fish wiith Daddy in the Ocean when he becomes a big boy. I told him we need a Proposal like 2-XA to be used so we will have places to fish. He wants to come to the meeting but I said it would be to long for a 4 year old. Anyway here is a picture of Daniel and his sister Hayley fishing. So please support 2-XA because Daniel and Hayleys Ocean experience is counting on it. Thank You, Daniel, Hayley, and Dad.

---

**From:** Elizabeth Ross [mailto:rfam@astound.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 7:25 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** MLPA 2-XA

Just wanted to show my support for proposal 2-XA. There is NO NEED to close more than is necessary to meet the requirements of the MLPA as we all saw in the first round @ Monterey Bay.

Rick Ross

---

**From:** Roger Lindsey [mailto:r\_lindsey@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 6:50 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Cc:** governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

**Subject:** MPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

As a Californian and avid Outdoorsman, I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socioeconomic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry! Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us (sport fishermen and women) to enjoy the sport we so love... responsibly as stewards for the Sea.

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

Roger Lindsey- Santa Rosa, Ca

---

From: stan krupin [<mailto:stanleykrupin@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:18 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

please support propsal 2-xa  
Thank you ,  
Stan Krupin

---

**From:** North, Steven R [<mailto:SRN5@pge.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 1:48 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Opt. 2XA support

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I fully realize the difficulty in striking a balance in most any project. Considering a variety of user groups, mentalities & unproven science makes this task even more difficult. Sportsmen have long been the champions of preservation of resources while actually partaking in those resources recreationally, spiritually and consumptively. This should not be about protection for the sake of protection, but protection of the common heritage of California which we share, sometimes differently than others.

Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

We have a long way to go to counter some man's negative influences on his environment. Let's not eliminate sportsmen from being effective messengers and "realtime" stewards and observers of the habitat and its inhabitants. In my opinion, over-restricting access is the worst thing that could happen in the long fight ahead. Losing the next generation's involved interest is at risk.



Sincerely,

Steven R. North

Lifelong sportsman and conservationist.

---

**From:** Tim McRitchie [mailto:tim\_mcritchie@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:41 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposal 2XA

Hello,

Ny husband is an ardent fisherman and has talked me into going out with him on occasion. I found that I really loved the ocean and the coastline, and to think that parts of it are going to be shut down is disheartening at best. We have gone over the proposals and I have found that proposal 2XA is the one that makes the most sense. Please give it a good look, we can all work with that proposal.

Susan McRitchie

---

**From:** Chambers, Timothy A [mailto:timothy.a.chambers@smithbarney.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 2:27 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Support for Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern:

After reading the many comments from others for the current proposals, I have had some additional thoughts to share.

I have been fishing the ocean waters outside of Bodega and San Francisco Bays for 25 years, and I am very concerned about the effects of any proposal but 2-XA being implemented. In 1999, the citizens of California elected to establish MPAs in our state waters. However, they did not vote to put an entire industry out of business, or to close off recreation to those who actually use the resource. I believe that is exactly what will happen if 2-XA is not adopted. Proposal 2-XA meets or exceeds all of the requirements of the MLPA and at the same time considers those who will be directly impacted by it; by that I mean businesses and recreational users.

Proposal 2-XA sets aside the required amount of marine ecosystems for complete preservation (SMRs) and still allows productive areas to be utilized in a sustainable manner. Am I disappointed about certain areas being closed? Yes. However, as a fisherman I am a conservationist. I want to see that my children (3) have equal or better opportunities than I have had, and these SMRs serve that purpose. I have looked at the maps for the other proposals and I am stunned by the amount and types of ocean areas placed into complete preservation (SMRs), effectively leaving virtual deserts to be shared by commercial and recreational fisherman. Just as it is here in our beautiful State of California, there are areas where crops can be grown and where deer and wildlife flourish. There are also many areas where it is challenging for anything to survive. It is no different in the ocean. Proposal 2-XA strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

My hope is that you would consider the comments from those of us who are **directly** impacted by the MPAs with more weight than those who are not. It is easy for someone to say "I support this idea" when it will have no direct impact on their livelihood, interests, or traditions. I believe all comments should be taken into account, but that they should be considered based upon first hand experience with our wonderful coastal waters.

Proposal 2-XA accomplishes what the law was intended to do. Let us put it in place to ensure our ocean can be appreciated by a broad range of Californians.

Thank you,  
Tim Chambers

---

From: maiertim@comcast.net [<mailto:maiertim@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 11:00 AM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern:

I enjoy sport fisherman, and love our coastal natural resources, which I want to see maintained and preserved for all California citizens to enjoy. We must maintain healthy fish population levels and the ecosystem, so others in this State have the opportunity like myself to enjoy fishing and eating with friends a great California renewable resource. This is why I strongly support Proposal 2-XA as from my thinking it is the most balanced, and considers the interests of all parties that use our ocean.

Proposal 2-XA is based upon strong science and conservation goals which meets the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. The Proposal I feel has broad support from all interested parties including fisherman, divers, conservation groups and coastal businesses. I am also excited about the fact that Proposal 2-XA has a strong commitment to marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation for the MPA cluster.

Thank-you for your consideration, and hopefully your support of Proposal 2-XA.

Tim Maier

---

**From:** Tim McRitchie [[mailto:tim\\_mccritchie@yahoo.com](mailto:tim_mccritchie@yahoo.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 5:21 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Marine closures

Dear sirs,

As a lifelong Californian I have had the privilege of fishing our coastline for my entire life. Now we face closures to certain areas, some reasonable, some questionable, some based on data that is debatable. I believe the proposal that seems to be the fairest and meets the stated requirements is proposal 2AX. This proposal certainly seems like the one that we can all live with. Thank you for your time.

Tim McRitchie

---

**From:** Odum Jr, William (WG) [<mailto:William.OdumJR@dow.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:51 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA All the Way

I am writing this email to implore you please vote for and implement Proposal 2-XA. I believe that proposal 2-XA is a hybrid that includes all interested party's concerns for the future health of our ecosystem here on the Pacific Ocean. I encourage you not to give into the demands of the interests that demand a hands off approach to the stewardship. I have used the resources of the Pacific Ocean for over 40 years. I am a true believer of demanding a healthy ecology for the Pacific Ocean, while at the same time utilizing its resources.

Please I implore you to pass and implement Proposal 2-Xa for the MLPA process

Sincerely,  
William G. Odum

---

**From:** Bill Shimmin [mailto:wtshimmin@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 27, 2008 11:13 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA 2-XA

Melissa,

Would you kindly forward this letter to those who are in the decision making process of the MLPA proposals to include the BRTF and the Commission.

I grew up about 2 miles north of what is now Sonoma State University, at the junction of Petaluma Hill Road and Crane Canyon Road. I now live in Rancho Cordova, east side of Sacramento near Folsom.

Bodega Bay was part of my "stomping grounds" as a kid. It still is today, although I've witnessed it undergo a transcending of purity as a fishing village to "Monterey North". It used to be an area considered the end of the world by many folks. You couldn't have paid them to live out in Bodega Bay! Take a look at the hillsides of Bodega Bay now. They are infested with multi million dollar homes and the sociological mindset pushing them.

I bring up the mindset of those who've built these lavish homes for a reason. The majority of these investment oriented part time residents, coupled to the central Bay Area commuter who in fact resides full time are focused on themselves. Not the greater overall picture. This same mindset is being applied by multiple special interest groups in their viewpoint of what the purpose of the MLPA process is all about.

I traveled to Arcata to attend the meeting at Humbolt State University. During the lunch time recess I sat in the campus cafeteria with a couple other folks attending the meeting. We were discussing the points of science being used to validate the MLPA. A few students (5), overheard us talking and asked if they could join us. We invited them in and that's when the real eye opener revealed itself.

These students were under the impression the MLPA process was an emergency action being taken because there were no controls over "raping" the ocean and it was the only way to create ocean areas where people wouldn't be allowed except for research purposes. I asked them, where did you get this ideology? Unsurprisingly, their own professor! So we asked them if they knew any other aspects of

the process. They didn't. What scared the daylights out of us was finding out their professor was of the marine biology department, and he was attending the meeting!

Point of the above is there are those willing to ignore the criteria of having to base MPA's, their scope and size based upon validated science. John Ugoretz proved this beyond any shadow of a doubt at the Bodega meeting when he declared acceptable science is whatever "we" decide it to be. You could have heard a pin drop in that room when he made that comment. Thankfully it was captured on tape. That told everyone present the CA. DFG was playing politics to appease the environmental special interest groups (Legacy Foundation and U.C. system), while at the same time protecting itself from potential future litigation and loss of funding. So yes, much of the decision making is based on popular whim and political motivators. They count on the general public being ignorant in order to spoon feed them misinformation. Feed it to them enough, and they'll believe it to be gospel. Those 5 college student's were perfect examples. Their minds were made up on what to believe for them by their biology professor. They weren't offered the entire package of information.

Conservation, I whole heartedly believe in. I firmly believe the MPA process can prove itself beneficial IF conducted honestly in the design of it's intent. Emotions and "Chicken Little" attitudes have no merit, and should not be recognized in selecting the appropriate MPA proposal.

Of the 4 proposals, proposal 2-XA is clearly the one meeting the scientific goals of the MPA. Not only does it meet the scientific, but meets the conservation goals too. 2-XA also makes it feasible for the CA. DFG to better enforce and it more than meets their feasibility demands. CA. DFG is already at bare bones manpower and underfunded. 2-XA maintains a high level of protection, incorporates 7 core areas of science based marine reserves and addresses total ecosystem protection. Many conservation organizations recognize 2-XA as being logical and sound. It makes sense.

Proposal #4 is so restrictive it creates danger to small boaters. Proposal 4 creates MPA's overly large, unfounded by necessity through science. It is the "Chicken Little" approach. Does proposal 4 does not fall within the guidelines for conservation as requested by the BRTF. Proposal 4 amounts to an 'ocean grab' to prevent the general public from being able to use it, only leaving the areas effectively accessible to "study groups". They are attempting to create an ocean based Yosemite National Park system where "you can look, but don't even think about touching it!"

I have 4 kid's. 3 boy's and a daughter ranging from 29 down to 15. They all grew up on the waters of our ocean. They learned to respect it. They grew up with the attitude of take only what's needed and monitor your resources in order to protect them. Be selective. Leave as little foot print as possible and to remember, you don't live down there...they do.

For each of them the entire aspects of vessel operation, learning the water, learning how to fish and how to target a particular fish in order to limit by-catch, watching whales surface or a pod of dolphins sideling the boat have opened up a wonderful world to them. They've spent years paying attention to the conditions of the ocean and what's in it. The changes that take place seasonally, what's different and the possible reasons of why. They monitor themselves with conscience. Proposal 4 is tantamount to micromanagement. In essence proposal 4 is telling them, and the general public they haven't the capability or aptitude to grasp what goes on out there.

The people who are out on the water know very well what's going on and what's needed. It's the speculative theorists who are land based that are the ignorant. You can't base a proposal selection through information with limited objective parameters. It's akin to running physics experiments without examining the what and why in the process of results.

Proposal 2-XA by far more than satisfies the science based guidelines and conservation desires of the MLPA process while allowing the public to enjoy (in limits), access to both the water and its resources.

William T. Shimmin